

REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed on February 6, 2006.

Applicant has amended the specification to correct informalities in paragraph [01], to provide missing reference numerals in paragraphs [030] and [031], to correct a figure number in paragraph [033], and to provide identification of the prior-filed application referred to in Paragraph [021].

Claims 1 – 32 were originally filed in the application. Claims 21 – 32 were withdrawn pursuant an earlier restriction requirement. Claims 33 – 35 were added in a previous Reply. Thus, Claims 1-20 and 33 - 35 are currently pending in the present application.

Claim 1 has been amended in part to correct informalities (i.e., the spelling of “perceptually, to change “to calculate” to ”for calculating”).

Claim 1 has also been amended for purposes of responding to the restriction requirement. Claim 1 has been amended to remove the limitation of the gamut conversion table. Claim 1 has also been amended to reference the hue angles in the gamut conversion unit. Claim 4 has been amended to conform the language therein to amended claim 1.

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to correct a grammatical informality by changing “that” to “to which.”

Claim 7 has been amended for purposes of responding to the restriction requirement. Claim 7 now depends directly from Claim 1 and sets forth a limitation on the gamut conversion unit to derive the gamut conversion values by traversing the edge of a gamut polygon to generate a saturation value at each hue angle.

Claim 8 has been amended to correct a language informality; it is the gamut conversion unit, not the values, that generate one color.

Claim 12 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 10 to claim 7.

Claim 34 has been amended to correct a language informality.

Applicant asserts that none of the amendments to the claims have been made in response to a substantive rejection of the claims.

The undersigned respectfully requests that the next Office Action Summary form show claims 21 – 32 as being withdrawn, in addition to the claims that are withdrawn as a result of the election in this Reply.

The undersigned also respectfully requests that the next Office Action indicate whether the drawing corrections filed with the Reply of December, 2006 have been approved.

Restriction Requirement under 35 USC § 121:

The Office Action sets forth a restriction requirement that presents two claim groupings:

Group I is composed of claims 1 – 12 and 33 – 35, drawn to a gamut conversion system, including independent claims 1 and 33; and

Group II is composed of claims 13 – 20, drawn to a gamut conversion unit with gamut conversion values calculated by traversing the edges of a plurality of gamuts, including independent claim 13.

The Office Action sets forth a further restriction requirement that presents two claim species (A) and (B) and four (4) sub-groups of species.

Traverse of Restriction Requirement

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement as to the two Species (A) and (B). Applicant asserts that using a look-up table as claimed in dependent Claim 4 is an implementation choice for storing gamut conversion values and is not an alternative species to traversing the edges of a gamut. Applicant respectfully requests that dependent claim 4 be included in the claims provisionally elected below.

Applicants also respectfully traverses the restriction requirement as to the four species sub-groups (1) – (4), in view of amended claims 7, 8 and 12 and species sub-groups (1) – (3). First, applicant believes that it is possible that the original language of claim 8 (species sub-group (1)), now corrected, may have incorrectly produced the separate sub-species (1). Secondly, Applicant believes that amended claim 7 encompasses both species sub-groups (1) and (2), and that amending the dependency of claim 12 to now depend from claim 7 also includes species sub-groups (3). Applicant

respectfully requests that dependent claim 12 be included in the claims provisionally elected below.

Provisional Election

Applicant provisionally elects Group 1, claims 1 – 12 and 33 – 35. Within Group I, Applicant provisionally elects Species Group (B), traversing the edges of a plurality of gamuts (claim 5) and traversing the edge of a gamut polygon to generate a saturation value at each hue angle (amended Claim 7). Applicant believes that the amendments to Claim 7 have put claim 7 in Species Group (B). If the Examiner believes that Claims 5 and 7 are themselves distinct, then Applicant provisionally elects Species Group (B) as it applies to amended Claim 7.

With respect to an election of species sub-groups (1) – (4), Applicant believes that the amendments to Claims 7 and 12 have put claim 7 in a generic form as to species sub-groups (1) – (3), and Applicant provisionally elects all of species sub-groups (1) – (3). This provisional election includes claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 12. Applicant is interpreting the restriction requirement of Group I and Species Group (A) as including claim 4 and claims 33 – 35.

If the Examiner determines that amended claim 7 is not generic as to species sub-groups (1) – (3), then Applicant further asserts that the amendments to Claim 7 have put claim 7 in a generic form as to species sub-groups (1) – (2). Therefore, in view of amended claim 7, Applicant provisionally elects both sub-group (1) and sub-group (2). This provisional election includes claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 11.

If the Examiner determines that amended claim 7 is not generic as to any combination of species sub-groups (1) – (4), then Applicant provisionally elects sub-group (1). This provisional election includes claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 9.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner favorably consider the statement of traverse above and include claims 4 and 12 in this election of claims.

Conclusion

Applicant has made every effort to properly comply with the response requirements set for in the Restriction Requirement. If the Examiner finds that Applicant has failed to properly respond, or if any of the response requirements is missing, the omission is entirely inadvertent and may be a result of a misinterpretation of the substance of the Restriction Requirement.

The Examiner is invited to contact Judith C. Bares at (707) 824-2486 for prompt resolution of items that may be missing or incorrect.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Judith C. Bares/
Judith C Bares, Reg. No. 35, 824

Dated: April 6, 2006